

1  
2 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
3 **DISTRICT OF NEVADA**  
4

5 GWENDOLYN RENEE REDDIC,

6 Plaintiff

7 v.

8 OFFICER SMITH, et al.

9 Defendants.

Case No. 2:23-cv-01224-CDS-NJK

**ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE**

10 The Court has a duty to ensure that it has subject matter jurisdiction over the dispute before  
11 it, which is an issue it can raise at any time. *See, e.g.*, Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(h)(3).

12 Plaintiff filed an application to proceed *in forma pauperis* and proposed complaint. Docket  
13 Nos. 2, 2-1. Plaintiff submits that this Court has federal question and diversity jurisdiction over  
14 the dispute.<sup>1</sup> Docket No. 2-1 at 4-5. Plaintiff fails, however, to allege any facts showing that the  
15 requirements of diversity or federal question jurisdiction are satisfied in this case. *See* Docket No.  
16 2-1; *see also* 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331, 1332; *Weller v. Dep't of Soc. Servs. for City of Balt.*, 901 F.2d  
17 387, 391 (4th Cir. 1990) (“Federal jurisdiction may not be premised on the mere citation of federal  
18 statutes”); *McCaa v. Mass. Mut. Life Ins. Co.*, 330 F. Supp. 2d 1143, 1149 (D. Nev. 2004) (party  
19 asserting subject matter jurisdiction must submit some facts or evidence showing that it is more  
20 likely than not that the amount in controversy threshold has been cleared). Plaintiff is hereby  
21 **ORDERED** to show cause in writing, by September 5, 2023, why this case should not be  
22 dismissed for lack of subject matter jurisdiction.

23 IT IS SO ORDERED.

24 Dated: August 4, 2023

25  
26   
Nancy J. Koppe  
United States Magistrate Judge

27  
28 <sup>1</sup> The Court construes the filings of *pro se* litigants liberally. *See, e.g., Blaisdell v. Frappiea*,  
729 F.3d 1237, 1240 (9th Cir. 2013).